



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,008	01/09/2007	Kenji Takami	65645(46590)	7375
21874	7590	07/10/2009	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP			POHNERT, STEVEN C	
P.O. BOX 55874			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02205			1634	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/10/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/581,008	TAKAMI ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
STEVEN C. POHNERT	1634	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) STEVEN C. POHNERT. (3) _____.
 (2) Jonathon Sparks. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 June 2009

Time: 10:00

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

5

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative in hopes of getting a better understanding of the claims. Applicant's representative noted that the claim language was required by applicant, but did his best at providing guidance as to his interpretation of the intent of the claims. The examiner specifically asked about step 1(b) of claim 5 and it was agreed it is attempting to generate a standrad value, but no guidance was provided for the context of "70% based on" or what the "relationship" required is. The examiner noted his intent to make the next action non-final.